



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/312,586	05/14/1999	TAYLOR S. GAUTIER	3941	2821

758 7590 10/18/2005

FENWICK & WEST LLP
SILICON VALLEY CENTER
801 CALIFORNIA STREET
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, VAN H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2194

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/312,586	Applicant(s) GAUTIER, TAYLOR S.	
	Examiner VAN H. NGUYEN	Art Unit 2194	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 July 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 and 20-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 and 20-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-16 and 20-36 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. **Claims 1, 2, 5, 8-16, 20, 21, 24, 27-31, 33, and 36** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Himmel** (U.S. 6,167,441).
4. **As to claim 14**, Himmel teaches the invention as claimed including a system for transmitting content data over a network (*e.g., support a multitude of different client devices for an Internet application...customize an Internet application for a variety of client devices; col.2, lines 14-24*), comprising:

a content server (*e.g., a web server; col.2, lines 29-30; col.4, line 55; and col.10, line 11*), for receiving a request (*e.g., a request; col.2, lines 25-35/an HTTP request; col.2, lines 36-39/accepts a client request; col.4, lines 55-56*) for content (*e.g., a file; col.2, lines 25-35*) from a client device (*e.g., a requesting client device; col.2, lines 25-35*), selecting non-optional and optional content of the content data (*e.g., the selected web page...according to the detected client type; col.7, lines 36-39*), the optional content selected responsive to performance characteristics

Art Unit: 2194

of the client device being selected from, among other things, amount of memory (*e.g., memory capabilities; see the Abstract; col.2, lines 30-32; and col.6, lines 18-27*) and transmitting the non-optional and selected optional content to the requesting client device (*e.g., the selected web page is sent to the client machine; col.7, lines 36-39/provide the image which will look the best for the detected client device; col.7, lines 51-52*).

5. **As to claim 15**, Himmel teaches a plurality of client devices (*e.g., a variety of client devices running a variety of browsers; col.3, lines 14-15*), for transmitting requests for content to the content server and receiving content transmitted from the content server (*col.4, lines 42-56*), at least one client device having different performance characteristics than at least one other client device (*e.g., depending on the client device, there will be differences in the capabilities of the display, memory and processor; col.3, lines 66-67*).

6. **As to claim 16**, Himmel teaches optimization constraints index classes of client devices based upon performance characteristics and the optional content within a context data is indexed by the optimization constraints (*col.5, lines 32-37 and col.6, lines 30-35*), and the content server selects optional content from the context data responsive to assigning an optimization constraint to a requesting client device (*col.6, lines 33-43*).

7. **As to claim 1**, the rejection of claim 14 above is incorporated herein in full. Additionally, Himmel further teaches:

storing a plurality of files, including files containing non-optional content data and optional content data (*e.g., a web server for storing files; col.10, lines 10-11*);

determining performance characteristics of the client device (*e.g., detecting client device display capability information about the requesting client device wherein the client device*

Art Unit: 2194

display capability information includes data relating to physical display characteristics of a client device display; col.10, lines 12-16); and

automatically including from the selected file the non-optional content data (col.5, lines 7-12) , and automatically selecting optional content data responsive to the performance characteristics of the requesting client device (e.g., some, but not all characteristics of the retrieved version of the file are dynamically modified according to the detected client device display capability information; col.10, lines 43-46).

8. **As to claim 2**, Himmel teaches selecting, one of a plurality of content items responsive to the performance characteristics of the requesting client device (*col.4, lines 42-54*).

9. **As to claim 5**, Himmel teaches optimization constraints are assigned to classes of client devices (*col.5, lines 32-37 and col.6, lines 30-35*), and each class of client device has different performance characteristics (*col. 3, lines 66-67*), further comprising: determining a class of client device to which the requesting client device belongs responsive to the determined performance characteristics of the requesting client device (*col.2, lines 36-42*); assigning the requesting client device an optimization constraint responsive to the determined class of client device to which the requesting client device belongs (*col.5, lines 32-37 and col.6, lines 30-35*); and selecting comprises selecting, a content item whose order corresponds to the optimization constraint (*col.10, lines 25-28*).

10. **As to claim 8**, Himmel teaches optimization constraints are associated with each content item (*col.5, lines 32-37 and col.6, lines 30-35*), and the optimization constraints index classes of client devices, wherein each class of client device has different performance characteristics (*col. 3, lines 66-67*), further comprising: assigning the requesting client device an optimization

Art Unit: 2194

constraint responsive to the performance characteristics of the requesting client device (*col.5, lines 32-37 and col.6, lines 30-35*); and selecting comprises selecting a content item responsive to the assigned optimization constraint (*col.4, lines 48-56 and col.7, lines 40-53*).

11. As to **claim 9**, Himmel teaches determining a connection type in use by the client device (*fig.3 and the associated text in col.6, lines 28-43*); and associating an optimization constraint responsive to the connection type of the client device (*col.5, lines 32-37 and col.6, lines 30-35*).

12. As to **claim 10**, Himmel teaches determining a web browser in use by the requesting device; and associating an optimization constraint responsive to the web browser in use by the requesting client device (*col.2, lines 36-52*).

13. As to **claim 11**, Himmel teaches determining a processor type in use by the requesting client device (*col.3, lines 66-67 and col.6, lines 28-33*); and associating an optimization constraint further comprises: associating an optimization constraint responsive to the processor type in use by the requesting client device (*col.3, lines 66-67 and col.6, lines 28-33*).

14. As to **claim 12**, Himmel teaches determining an amount of memory in use by the requesting client device (*col.6, lines 25-27*); and associating an optimization constraint further comprises: associating an optimization constraint responsive to the amount of memory in use by the requesting client device (*see the Abstract; col.2, lines 30-32; and col.6, lines 18-27*).

15. As to **claim 13**, Himmel teaches determining a display type in use by the requesting client device (*col.2, lines 66-67 and col.4, lines 42-45*); and associating an optimization constraint further comprises: associating an optimization constraint responsive to the display type in use by the requesting client device (*col.4, lines 48-54*).

Art Unit: 2194

16. As to **claim 20**, the rejections of claims 1 and 14 above are incorporated herein in full.

Additionally, Himmel further teaches requesting a web page and transmitting the web page (*col.4, lines 48-51*).

17. As to **claims 21, 24, and 27-29**, they include the same subject matter as in claims 2, 5, and 8-10 above, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

18. As to **claims 30, 31, and 33**, they are directed to a computer-readable medium for implementing the method of claims 1, 2, and 5 above, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

19. As to **claim 36**, the rejections of claims 1 and 14 above are incorporated herein in full. Additionally, Himmel further teaches determining a class of device to which the requesting client device belongs responsive to the performance characteristics of the requesting client device (*col.5, lines 32-37 and col.6, lines 30-35*); assigning the requesting client device an optimization constraint responsive to the determined class of client device (*col.5, lines 32-37 and col.6, lines 30-35*); and selecting one of a plurality of content items responsive to the assigned optimization constraint (*col.4, lines 48-56 and col.7, lines 40-53*).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

20. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Art Unit: 2194

21. **Claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 22, 23, 25, 26, 32, 34, and 35** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Himmel** in view of **Ogdon et al.** (U.S. 6,598,075).

22. **As to claim 3**, Himmel does not explicitly teach the plurality of content items is ordered with respect to highest and lowest performance characteristics of client devices, and selecting comprises: responsive to a client device having a highest performance characteristic, selecting a first ordered content item.

Ogdon teaches the plurality of content items is ordered with respect to highest and lowest performance characteristics of client devices, and selecting comprises: responsive to a client device having a highest performance characteristic, selecting a first ordered content item (*abstract and col.3, lines 26-65*).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ogdon with Himmel because Ogdon's teachings would have provided the capability for facilitating the customization of the selected Web pages in an Internet environment based on the capability information of the requesting client devices and for efficiently transmitting the customized Web pages to the requesting client devices.

23. **As to claim 4**, Ogdon teaches the plurality of content items is ordered with respect to highest and lowest performance characteristics of client devices, and selecting comprises: responsive to a client device having a highest performance characteristic, selecting a last ordered content item (*col.4, lines 40-65*).

Art Unit: 2194

24. As to **claim 6**, Ogdon teaches responsive to an optimization constraint specifying a class of device having a lowest performance characteristic, selecting a content item requiring a least amount of bandwidth to be transmitted (*col.4, lines 40-65*).

25. As to **claim 7**, Ogdon teaches responsive to an optimization constraint specifying a class of device having a lowest performance characteristic, selecting a content item requiring a least amount of data (*col.4, lines 40-65*).

26. As to **claims 22, 23, 25, 26**, they include the same subject matter as in claims 3, 4, 6, and 7 above, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

27. As to **claims 32, 34, and 35**, they are directed to a computer-readable medium for implementing the method of claims 3, 8, and 9 above, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

28. Applicant's arguments filed 26 July 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

29. In the remarks, Applicant argued in substance that Himmel does not disclose the performance characteristic affecting selection of optional content in accordance with claim 20 **is selected from the group consisting of** remote device operating system, connection type, processor type, amount of memory, user preferences, display size, and software installed.

30. Examiner respectfully traverses Applicant's remarks.

Art Unit: 2194

31. Himmel does meet claim 20 and all other independent claims 1, 14, 30, and 36 as amended by Applicant. In fact, Himmel teaches the performance characteristics being selected from, among other things, amount of memory (*e.g., memory capabilities; see the Abstract; col.2, lines 30-32; and col.6, lines 18-27*). It is noted that the prior art **only needs to teach one** of elements in the group following **“consisting of”** to meet the claim limitation.

Conclusion

32. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

33. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

34. Any inquiry or a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist: (571) 272-2100.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

Art Unit: 2194

examiner should be directed to VAN H. NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571) 272-3765. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30AM – 6:00PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternative Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor WILLIAM THOMSON can be reached on (571) 272-3718.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:
Commissioner for patents
P O Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

CNR
W-tum
TC 2100
SPE - 2194